IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, ANDHRA PRADESH
AT HYDERABAD

(Special Original Jurisdiction)

MONDAY, THE THIRTEENTH DAY OF SEPTEMBER
TWO THOUSAND AND FOUR

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE A.GOPAL REDDY

-

WRIT PETITION NO : 16262 of 2004

Between:

Professional Organization for Welfare & Education, Reserach (Power),
rep. by its President, G. Yadaiah Goud S/o. Lalaiah
R/o. H.No. 18-4-153/3, Outside Aliabad, Hyd.

..... PETITIONER

AND

1 The Chief Transport Officer, Municipal Corporation of Hyderabad, Malakpet, Hyd.
2 The Commissioner, Municipal Corporation of Hyderabad, Tankbund Hyd.
3 Srikanth Reddy, R/o Aliabad, Hyd.

.....RESPONDENT(S)

Petition under Article 226 of the constitution of India praying that in the circumstances stated in the Affidavit filed herein the High Court will be pleased to Issue an order or orders more particularly one in the nature of writ of mandamus, declaring the action of the Respondent No.1 herein in allotting tender in connection with vide No.No.1/CTO/MCH/2004, dt. 15.5.2004 of the respondent No.3 herein as illegal, arbitrary, violative of minimum wages Act, and violative of principles of natural justice.

Counsel for the Petitioner:MR.V.RAGHUNATH

Counsel for the Respondent Nos.1 and 2: MR.G.RAMA RAO, Standing Counsel for MCH

Counsel for the Respondent No.3: ----

The Court at the stage of admission made the following ORDER:

Except stating that the petitioner quoted lower rates than that of the third respondent and the quotation, which the petitioner has quoted is as per the Labour Laws and the third respondent has quoted against the Labour Laws, it is no where stated that how the awarding of the work to the third respondent is arbitrary and illegal and on what date, the said work was allotted to the third respondent.

On the other hand, the learned Standing Counsel for the respondents 1 and 2 stated that rates quoted by the third respondent were accepted and the work was awarded to the third respondent, who is now executing the said work.

In view of the same, no relief can be granted to the petitioner. The learned counsel for the petitioner also failed to substantiate how the tender quoted by the third respondent is contrary to the Labour Laws or Minimum Wages Act.

In view of the same, I see no grounds to entertain the writ petition and therefore, liable to be dismissed.

The writ petition is accordingly dismissed. No costs.

13th SEPTEMBER, 2004.

Kvni

To

1 The Chief Transport Officer, Municipal Corporation of Hyderabad, Malakpet, Hyd.
2 The Commissioner, Municipal Corporation of Hyderabad,
Tankbund, Hyd.

3 Two CD copies.